



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/576,632	04/26/2007	Ramin Shahidi	STAN.P0009PCTUS	5774
Mani Adeli Slatler Johansen & Adeli LLP 1875 Century Park East Suite 1360 Los Angeles, CA 90067				
EXAMINER BRUTUS, JOEL F				
ART UNIT 3768				
PAPER NUMBER				
MAIL DATE 04/28/2009				
DELIVERY MODE PAPER				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/576,632

Applicant(s)

SHAHIDI, RAMIN

Examiner

JOEL F. BRUTUS

Art Unit

3768

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 April 2007.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 April 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-893)
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

2. Claims 4-6 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 26 of copending Application No. 10/576,781. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Regarding claim 4, the co-pending 26 is identical to the examined claim. Claims 5-6 are rejected because they depend on a rejected claim.

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422

F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1-3 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No. 10,576,781. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because.

Regarding claim 1, co-pending claim 1 teaches all other limitations; except the word "creating" a view field from a predetermined position, and optionally orientation, relative to the instrument in the reference coordinate system.

However, the co-pending claim includes "projecting onto the display a field of view" from a perspective of the instrument in the reference coordinate system.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify co-pending claim 1 by creating a field of view; in order to monitor the instrument within the patient with increased visualization and accuracy.

Regarding claims 2-3, they are rejected because they depend on a rejected claim.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shahidi (US Pat: 6,167,296).

Regarding claims 1-3, Shahidi teaches surgical instrument may include an ultrasound transducer located at the tip, which itself scans and detects ultrasound imaging data when placed in contact with the patient's head that anticipates the claimed invention. FIG. 4 is a schematic block diagram showing the intra-operative ("intra-op") ultrasound ("US") protocol for handling the US image data during surgery [see column 7 lines 36-45]. Typically the ultrasound transducer is a phased focusing array which generates data from a planar fan-shaped sector of the anatomical region of interest, where the central axis of the transducer lies in the plane of the scan sector which, in this context, is collinear with the longitudinal axis of the surgical instrument. By rotating the instrument and transducer about this axis, US scan data is collected and stored for a cone-shaped volume in the region of interest. This cone defines the "field of view" of the transducer scan [see column 7 lines 36-53]. Referring still to FIG. 3, the next phase of the pre-op protocol is to determine the location and orientation of the view vector to define the image to be displayed. This view vector is obtained by querying the optical tracking system to ascertain the current location and orientation of

the surgical instrument [see column 7 lines 13-17]; with this information, the three-dimensional scan data is then manipulated to position and orient the resulting three-dimensional perspective view and to define cutting planes and reference markers in the displayed image indicating and clarifying this view [see column 7 lines 18-22].

After an incision has been made in the patient's head, the endoscope may be inserted to provide an internal view of the target anatomy. Referring now to FIG. 10, the drawing shows a highly simplified sketch of a three-dimensional image display obtained by the above system with the endoscope of FIG. 1 in the alternative position shown by the dotted lines, pointing toward the target lesion or tumor. The display has been manipulated to provide a three-dimensional sectional view with a cutting plane passing through the tip of the endoscope and orthogonal to its axis. Again, the endoscope field of view 905 is indicated in the display, and in a preferred embodiment auxiliary displays are also presented showing the actual image seen by the endoscope in the field of view, and the 3D perspective image for the same region in the field of view; these auxiliary displays are also not shown in FIG. 10. This Figure further preferably includes also the conventional axial, coronal and sagittal 2D displays for purposes of further clarification and elucidation [see column 10 lines 46-63].

Regarding claims 4-6, all other limitations are taught as set forth by Shahidi above. Shahidi further teaches FIG. 7 is a schematic block diagram of a flow chart for a program that implements the ultrasound intra-op protocol. The program starts by causing the computer to receive and load the data from a US transducer at the tip of

the surgical instrument. Such data is produced normally using polar or spherical coordinates to specify locations in the region of interest, and the program converts this data preferably to Cartesian coordinates [see column 8 lines 59-62]. Next, optical tracking system data is read to determine the position and orientation of the surgical instrument and US data from the aggregation of aligned data slices is utilized to reconstruct 3D image data representing the US scan data. This image data is manipulated and transformed by the program in a manner similar to the manipulation of the pre-op data, and the resulting image is displayed [see column 8 lines 55-65].

When the surgical instrument is an endoscope or US transducer, the field of view 116 is also indicated in the display by the quasi-circular image indicating the intersection of the conical field of view with the surface of the skin viewed by the endoscope. This conical field of view is also superimposed, for completeness, in the 2D displays. In a preferred embodiment, displays are also presented showing the actual image seen by the endoscope in the field of view, and the 3D perspective image for the same region in the field of view; these auxiliary displays are not shown in the drawings. Similar auxiliary displays are preferably included when the instrument 109 is an ultrasound transducer [see column 10 lines 31-45].

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOEL F. BRUTUS whose telephone number is

(571)270-3847. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM (Off alternative Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on (571)272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. F. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 3768

/Long V Le/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3768